DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 995 CS 502 718

AUTHOR Cavanaugh, Mary; And Others
TITLE Power and Communication Behavior: A Formulative Investigation.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (65th, San Antonio, TX, November 10-13, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Patterns; Communication (Thought Transfer); *Leadership; Leadership Styles; *Power Structure; *Research Methodology; *Speech Communication

ABSTRACT

As part of a research program designed to explicate the construct "power," a formulative research strategy was used to identify 37 personal orientations toward power. A preliminary instrument based on these orientations was administered to samples of corporate executives, government employees, law enforcement personnel, and sales associates. A final instrument, based on the seven factors common to all four samples, was checked for reliability and validity. Validity checks included correlating the seven power orientation scores with the sentencing decisions of district court judges, the leadership styles of managers, and the dogmatism of business and community leaders. (Appendixes include data tables and a copy of the power orientation scale.) (Author/FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED178995

POWER AND COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR: A FORMULATIVE INVESTIGATION

Mary Cavanaugh
Carl Larson
Al Goldberg
Jeffrey Bellows

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mary Cavanaugh, Carl Larson, Al Goldberg, Jeffrey Bellows
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Dept. of Speech Communication
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado 80208
(303) 753-2057

ABSTRACT

Following a formulative research strategy, 37 personal orientations toward power were identified. A preliminary instrument based on these 37 orientations was administered to samples of corporate executives, government employees, law enforcement personnel, and sales associates. A final instrument, based on the 7 factors common to all 4 samples, was checked for reliability and validity. Validity checks included correlating the 7 power orientation scores with the sentencing decisions of the District Court judges, the leadership styles of managers, and the dogmatism scores of business and community leaders.

CS502718

POWER AND COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR:

A FORMULATIVE INVESTIGATION

INTRODUCTION

Several communication theorists have argued strongly that in our attempt to understand human communication phenomena greater attention should be paid to the construct "power." Miller (1977, p. 15) has contended, "Every lay person and communication scholar alike realize that in many communicative situations the variable of power explains a great deal of the variance." Brown and Keller (1973, p. 165) have asserted, "It may not be too much to hypothesize that power is the most important factor in any communication."

Over the past 40 years theory and research by social scientists has produced no single, uniform conceptualization of power. Nagel (1975, p. 4) has concluded that, "Despite, or perhaps because of its ubiquity, the term power often fosters more disagreement than understanding. In popular speech and writing, it is applied on the basis of intuition, preconception or dogma."

Two explanations have been offered as to why the phenomenon of power has remained so elusive. Martin (1971) attributed part of the problem to a lack of agreement about basic definitions and to theorists' use of idiosyncratic terminology. Clark (1968, p. 271) claimed, "It has been generally true that any single author deals only with those aspects of power which are of particular importance in clarifying a specific theoretical or empirical problem. Idiosyncratic theoretical views of power combined with relatively narrow explications of the construct have produced a body of knowledge about power typically characterized as "scattered, heterogenous, even chaotic" (Cartwright, 1965, p. 3). Tedeschi and Bonoma (1972, p. 2) attempted to account for such chaos by proposing, "One possible explanation why the concept of power encompasses so much aggregate data and so many dissimilar disciplines is that it has developed from a series of intuitive analyses spanning several centuries."

Whatever the present state-of-the-art, and explanations thereof, it is clear that the construct "power" lacks explication sufficient for its productive use by communication theorists and researchers attempting to understand Human Communication phenomena. For these reasons, we embarked on a research program designed to explicate the construct "power."

The clarification or explication of constructs is generally regarded as formulative or exploratory research. Selltiz, Wrightsman and Cook (1976, p. 91) state:

> Few well-trodden paths exist for investigators of social relations to follow; theory is often either too general or too specific to provide clear guidance for empirical research. In these circumstances, exploratory research is necessary to obtain the experience that will be helpful in formulating relevant hypotheses for more definitive investigation.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Our efforts in this formulative investigation were directed towards explicating the construct "power" as it might be represented in the general population. That is, we were interested in how people view power, what the concept means to people, what they perceive to be its legitimate and illegitimate uses, and what implications or consequences are associated with its possession. We were interested in identifying people's orientations toward power ultimately so as to test our belief that these orientations toward power would be manifested in an individual's communicative behaviors toward others.

In pursuing these objectives we followed the basic format outlined by Selltiz, Wrightsman and Cook (1976) for the conduct of formulative or exploratory research. Our basic strategy consisted of: (1) A review of the power literature in order to identify, on an a priori basis, the various dimensions of power, thus far identified, along which individuals might orient themselves; (2) A survey of individuals who have had practical experience with the phenomenon power, in

order to add to the dimensions thus far identified, any additional dimensions which might have been overlooked by the theorists or researchers; (3) The derivation from Steps 1 and 2 of a set of dimensions, reasonably exhaustive, which might in some combination, describe a given individual's orientations toward power; (4) Securing responses to these dimensions from homogeneous samples of individuals, in order to discern the specific orientations characterizing each sample; (5) The identification of those orientations which recur across samples, and therefore, might be assumed to represent common orientations toward power, present in the population at large; (6) The development of a self-report scale for assessing individual orientations toward power; and (7) The preliminary testing of this scale for its adequacy (reliability and validity) in providing an empirical index of a given individual's orientations toward power. The results of executing these steps are reported in the remainder of this manuscript.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Power as a Characteristic of the Individual

The first conceptual framework emerging from the literature is the notion of power as it is situated in a single actor. Three perspectives are presented within this first framework.

The Personal Nature of Power. Hillenbrand (1949) suggests that the locus of power was the individual himself. He argues against the notion that power is a function of ascribed values or organizational/social roles. His position is clear: "It cannot be emphasized enough that institutions as such never exercise power; it is always the men in charge of institutions, whether national or international, who have power" (p. 6). Several other writers (Guardini, 1961; Rosinski, 1965) support this view by ascribing power to individual or organismic roots. As Berle (1969) puts it, "Power is an attribute of man. It does not exist without a holder" (p. 60).

Adler saw the expression of power as a "compensatory mechanism" and said, "Whatever men are striving for originates from their urgent attempts to overcome the impression of deficiency, insecurity, weakness" (p. 167). May (1972) further explored the domain of power from the context of the personality. He saw five separate levels of expressed power moving from exploitive to manipulative to competitive to nutrient to integrative.

Power, according to May, undergoes a maturational or developmental process. The infant begins life with an inate "power to be" and identity progresses through the stages as he matures until he reaches the integrative level (power with another) (p. 110).

Power as a Person-Environment Interaction. The notion of power as an individual characteristic is expanded. Power is viewed as a potential which affects and, in turn, is affected by its specific environment. deCharmes (1968) expresses the person-environment relationship when he defines "personal causation" as "the personal knowledge of being an agent of change in the environment" (p. 271). Sites (1973) highlites the interactional nature of the person-environment relationship by suggesting that "the individual can manipulate both environment and self and thus, within limits, construct his own reality and his behavior toward it. Since he can construct it, he can control it" (p. 56).

The Power Motive. The power motive is framed within the context of individual behaviors oriented toward the attainment of goals that deal with controlling others. Kipnis (1974) describes power motivations as advising "when an individual experiences an aroused need state that can only be satisfied by inducing appropriate behavior in others" (p. 84). Minton's (1972) analysis of the power motive as "a power dimension that refers to variations across individuals regarding the extent to which one is motivated to attain specific goals of power" (p. 105)

seems representative of the general view of the power motive. Minton goes on to describe two basic orientations toward power within the context of the power motive. Intrinsic motivation is seen to be that set of behaviors which are self-initiated, and ultimately generate feelings of self-determination. Extrinsic motivation is related to behaviors wherein power goals are externally determined (p. 26.).

Winter (1973) also takes the position that the power motive can be defined as "a disposition to strive for certain kinds of goals, or to be affected by certain kinds of incentives" (p. 17). For Winter, the power motive is found by examining the "thoughts, images, and theme in the minds of people when power is aroused or made salient to them" (p. 10).

McClelland (1975), working from the power motive set, defines power as "thoughts about someone having impact" (p. 7). The motivation for having impact could be stemmed from three separate roots:

(1) Through strong, direct action involving control or influence.

(2) Through the production of actions which would produce an emotional response in another individual.

(3) Through a concern for reputation (p. 28).

McClelland's strategies are not necessarily discrete categories. Any or all of the motivations might be in force at any time. The drive for power goals may be situational, as well as dependent on individual predispositions to rank one drive factor ahead of the others. That is, certain individuals may be oriented toward a "concern for reputation", and may ascribe power behaviors to this drive regardless of their appropriateness within a given context.

Summary. The dimensions of power emerging from this conceptual framework were:

(1) The importance of the individual powerholder as a catalyst in manifestations of power.

(2) The conceptualization of power as a person-environment interaction.

(3) The conceptualization of power as an impact that goes beyond control of behavior of others.

(4) The manifestation of power as either an approach ("Hope of Power") or an avoidance ("Fear of Power") motive, and

(5) The distinction between a "personalized" and a "socialized" face of power.

Power as an Interpersonal Construct

This conceptual framework enlarges the previous concept of power as a personality construct to include social relationship. Emerson (1962) states, "Power is a property of the social relation; it is not an attribute of an actor" (p. 32). Developing a conceptual framework around an interpersonal theme requires that the role of the target in the power relation be examined. Two major aspects of the target's role are identified.

Field-Theoretic Approach. Cartwright (1959) represents this approach by presenting power as "those psychological forces acting in P's life space which are activated by agents other than P" (p. 218). Power is seen to exist within a social matrix and consideration would be given to the extent of change A could induce in B over and above B's resistance. Levinger (1959) characterizes the ability to move another individual in a given direction as "the ability to exert interpersonal influence" (p. 83). Implicit in that term is "the manipulation of valences in another person's psychological environment" (p. 83). Levinger sees "valences" as including both positive and negative forces that are significant to the target's psychological space.

Kelman (1974) contributes to this view by adding the idea "that if the target perceived the powerholder as able to mediate goal achievement, the responsiveness of the target to the influence attempt would increase" (p. 33). French and Raven (1959) conclude that there are five bases of social power: (1) reward, (2) coercive, (3) legitimate, (4) referent, and (5) expert. Later Raven (1965) adds information power as a sixth base. Three of these bases are focused on the powerholder and his ability to change the behavior of the

target (reward, coercive and informational) while the other three (legitimate, referent and expert) relate part of the success of the powerholder to the perceptions that the target holds about him. Lehman (1969) identifies the types of resources which would be important to the concrete application of power:

(1) Utilitarian resources - composed of material goods and services.
(2) Coercive resources - composed of physical force and violence.
(3) Normative resources - composed of shared beliefs, values and sentiments (p. 454).

The field-theoretic model is concerned with perceived resources and target resistance, and makes an implicit statement regarding the reciprocal nature of power. The following perspective makes this relationship explicit.

Outcome Approach. Martin (1971) expresses the reciprocal nature of the power relationship by suggesting "that power relations may be relations of mutual convenience, power may be a resource facilitating the achievement of the goals of both A and B..." (p. 243). The net effect of the power relationship is measured by the discrepancy between the power goals achieved by A and those achieved by B. Thibaut and Kelley (1959) describe those goals as "matters of interest" and develop an outcome matrix:

> If two persons interact, the pattern of outcomes given in their interaction matrix indicates that each person has the possibility of affecting the other's reward-cost position and, thereby, of influencing or controlling him (p. 100).

Emerson (1962) defines social relationship in general as "ties of mutual dependence" (p. 32) and suggests "Power resides implicitly in the other's dependency" (p. 32). This dependency is directly proportional to the amount of motivational investment a target has in the outcome or goals that are mediated by the powerholder, and is inversely proportional to how available these goals or outcomes are outside of the present relationship between the powerholder and the target. If the goals are not important to the target or are readily available from someone other than the powerholder, the power of that source would considerably diminish.

Summary. These two aspects (Field-Theoretic Approach and Outcome Approach) of the interpersonal construct framework contribute new dimensions of power to

the item pool for the Power Orientation Scale. From the Field-Theoretic Approach come two characteristics of the manifestation of power:

(1) The agent must see himself as having the ability to move forces within another individual. This required the ability of the source to correctly sort out which resources that he possessed were important to which targets in what types of situations.

(2) The "perceptions" of the target about the resources available to an agent must be considered.

From the Outcome Approach comes an emphasis on the reciprocal nature of the power relationship. This reciprocity would come from either the desire of both parties to achieve valued outcomes or from the existence of a mutual dependency between the two parties.

Power as a Commodity

The third conceptual framework, power as a commodity, is developed from the interpersonal construct framework. While both are social matrix frameworks, the nature of the power relationship is considered transactional in the commodity framework, rather than interactional as in the interpersonal construct framework. Generally, power is discussed in the commodity framework in "economic" terms. Central to the commodity notion is the cost involved in maintaining power and how that affects the behavior of the powerholder.

Three basic models of the commodity framework are presented: (1) the cost of power; (2) power and control of resources; and (3) power as exchange.

The Cost of Power. Harsanyi (1962) introduces this position with the suggestion that "a realistic quantitative description of A's power over B must include, as an essential dimension of this power relation, the costs to A of attempting to influence B's behavior (p. 70). This cost approach is useful in making comparisons of degrees of power. If one individual can accomplish something at far less cost than another individual, the former can be said to possess greater power than the latter.

Breed (1971) sums up the cost of power model. He states that the application of power involves three separate costs:

> (1) of the assets "consumed" as power is generated;
> (2) of the power itself as it is spent;
> (3) and of symbolic gestures which, the more often they are used, tend to hasten the point of actual expenditure (p. 126).

Power and Control of Resources. Burt (1977) assumes "that actors are purposive in that they use their control of resources in order to improve their individual well-being..." (p. 6). The focus here is on one's ability to constrain the allocation of resources such that accurate predictions result about the ability of an actor to realize his own interests despite resistance from other actors.

Power as Exchange. This model, as advanced by Homans (1958), posits that "for a person engaged in exchange what he gives may be a cost to him, just as what he gets may be a reward, and his behavior changes less as profit, that is, reward less cost, tends to a maximum" (p. 606). Cost is here viewed in the negative sense. That is, the higher the cost of an activity to an individual, the less likely he is to perform it.

Champlin (1971) describes the basic nature of the exchange model when he states, "Having power is thus being in a position to get others to do what one wants them to do without having to make unacceptable sacrifices. The more the behavior of others can be shaped to one's wants, and the less one gives to achieve this, the more power one has" (p. 94).

Summary. The major contribution emerging from the commodity framework is the notion of the cost to the powerholder in the power relationship.

Power as a Causal Construct

This framework is primarily concerned with developing specificity in the operational aspects of the study of power. The thinking of researchers working in this area is that by placing power in a causal framework it would become less

of an abstract notion and more subject to study by traditional empirical technique.

Two basic characterics are involved in the causal construct framework: (1) power as asymmetic; and (2) power within the probability or mathematical context.

Power as Asymmetric. March (1955) expresses the operational flavor of this framework in his description, "Specifically, the set of all influence relations is here defined to be the subset of all causal relations such that the behavior of an individual appears as the terminal point in the causal linkage" (p. 473). Nagel (1975), in the same vein, defines an actual or potential power relation as "an actual or potential causal relation between the preferences of an actor regarding an outcome and the outcome itself" (p. 29).

Riker (1964) sees two basic types of causal relation: (1) recipe causality and (2) necessary and sufficient condition. Recipe causality involves statements of manipulation. The manipulated variable is presumed to cause the intended outcome and if no manipulation occurs, then no causal relationship exists between the two events. Recipe causality emphasizes how to make two specific events occur. Riker relates this to a concern with "other-oriented" power outcomes. A power outcome that is "other-oriented" emphasizes behaviors that lead to the disutility of some other person.

Necessary and sufficient condition causality is concerned with the constellation of antecedent events in force in relation to a specific consequence. When necessary and sufficient condition causality operates, the attention is on a full explanation of the outcome. The effect itself becomes the focal point, not the manipulation of a variable to produce the event. Riker compares this type of causality with an "ego-oriented" form of power. The emphasis of ego-oriented power is on constraining the interaction itself. The agent of the power situation (ego) increases his own utility by maintaining the ability to control the

interaction. His interest is focused on increasing his own utility rather than decreasing the utility of others.

The Probability or Mathematical Context. Kahn and Boulding (1964) define power as "the ability of one person or group of persons to...change the probabilities that others will respond in certain ways to specified stimuli" (p. 12). Gamson (1974) carries on with the basic definition of power in probability terms and argues for models that place the examination and measurement of power in a mathematical context:

> Instead of attempting to make statements about how much or what kind of power A has over B, we should speak instead of how much and what kind of power A has over a specific domain of B's decisions. The dividend we receive for this change is the employment of the highly useful conceptualization of power as a change in probability (p. 20).

Power is then determined by the difference between the probabilities that an individual would choose a given alternative prior to, and after, an alleged exercise of power. Gamson concludes, "Power has been succesfully exercised if and only if there is a difference" (p. 21). Schopler and Layton (1974) capture the essential nature of the mathematical model in suggesting, "Minimum attributed power exists when B does something unpredictable, which is perfectly predictable from A's intervention" (p. 40).

Summary. Power as a causal construct provides additional dimensions to the pool for the development of the Power Orientation Scale. This perspective interprets power as specific to behaviors of the source which elicited certain responses from the target within the power relation. Further, when placed in the context of the probability model, the situations in which power can be examined are greatly expanded. Both the discussion of the asymmetric nature of power relationships and Riker's "ego/other" orientations were useful in building the pool of power dimensions.

Power as a Philosophical Construct

The philosophical component provides the fifth and final framework. Four basic lines of thinking emerge in this construct: (1) morality or amorality of power; (2) power and values; (3) power and responsibility; and (4) power and social norms.

Morality or Amorality of Power. This first line of thought centers on the nature of power itself. Hobbes (1971) suggests that power is "a present means to achieve some future apparent good..." (p. 72). However, most theorists and philosophers view power as neither intrinsically good nor evil. Rosinski (1965) says, "Were it not equally potent for good or evil, it would not be power at all" (p. 22). Guardini (1961) supports the view of power as essentially a neutral force. He argues, "Power awaits direction. Unlike forces of nature, it becomes part of a cause-and-effect relationship, not through necessity, but only through the intervention of an agent" (p. 3). Actors, then, determine the morality of power. Votaw (1966) describes the two different orientations in this way, "A man who believes power to be essentially evil will approach the issues of power in a very different way from the man who sees power as a resource of human society, al beit subject to abuse" (p. 12).

Power and Values. Kahn and Boulding (1964) approach power and values from three vantage points:

(1) Subjective feelings: The "What's in it for me" position. The powerholder with this orientation would want to arrange a power relation to be sure there would be "something in it" for the target as well in order to make compliance enticing.

(2) Depersonalized values/choices made by force: This individual would choose a coercive mode and would try to legitimize his power on the basis of an ideology rather than on personal traits.

(3) Relativist approach: Values are objective and grounded in the situation. An individual ascribing to this approach would choose to ground his power in terms of his expertise and would try to have others understand the situation as he does.

Different approaches to value systems would be reflected in different power patterns or the way an individual would choose to exercise power.

Power and Responsibility. This dimension ties a notion of responsibility to the exercise of power. By accepting great amounts of responsibility an individual also accepts the power that would be necessary to take the actions that go along with responsibility. Berle (1969) says, "Power is invariably confronted with, and acts on the presence of a field of responsibility" (p. 155).

Power and Social Norms. This fourth approach argues that the value-loading on the term power itself has given it a negative connotation in the society at large. Martin and Sims (1956) suggest that although ambition is glorified in the abstract, it is often frowned upon in practice. McClelland (1975) contends that an individual quickly learns that to act on behalf of others is legitimate, but to act on behalf of oneself is not. Finally, Gross (1968) presents a strong criticism of the social attitude toward power. "Power, like sex under the Victorians, has often been regarded as a subject not to be openly discussed but rather to be sought, thought about and used under the cover of darkness" (p. 77).

Summary. All of these issues provide very different bases from which items about orientations to power were drawn. The application of thoughts about good and evil, values, responsibility and social norms provide diverse input for the item pool.

EXPANDING THE DIMENSIONS OF POWER

The dimensions of power extracted from the literature may or may not exhaust orientations individuals hold toward power. In order to expand upon the dimensions of power extracted from the literature an additional step was necessary. An open-ended survey was conducted following a purposive sampling plan which selected twelve respondents from civil service positions (6 administrators and

6 staff), thirty-three middle-level managers, and nine corporate-level executives. These fifty-four respondents were probed with questions designed to elicit their positive and negative reactions to being in a position of power and their attitudes about acceptable and unacceptable uses of power. Each response of each of the fifty-four respondents was compared with the dimensions extracted from the literature. Any dimension from the survey not already adequately represented by a dimension extracted from the literature resulted in an additional dimension being added to the list. A consensus decision on the part of three members of the research team was the criterion for adding a dimension. This process resulted in the identification of seventeen additional dimensions representing orientations toward power. The final set of thirty-seven dimensions of power, isolated from both the literature review and the survey, follows:

1. The ability to control outcomes.
2. The ability to control persons.
3. The ability to control specific behaviors.
4. Enhancing one's own position.
5. Minimizing one's cost or effort.
6. The ability to resist control.
7. Having impact.
8. Group goal attainment.
9. An approach toward power.
10. An avoidance of power.
11. The ability to control tangible resources.
12. The ability to control intangible resources.
13. The ability to restrict the alternatives of others.
14. Power as expertise.
15. Referent power.

16. Legitimate power.
17. Power as situational.
18. The intentionality of power.
19. Power as natural instinct.
20. Power as reciprocal.
21. The avoidance of powerlessness.
22. Power as potential.
23. Control of sanctions.
24. Power as amoral.
25. Power as secrecy.
26. Shared power.
27. Power as positive.
28. Power as negative.
29. The psychological benefits of power.
30. Power through the display of weakness.
31. Power in conflict.
32. Power as responsibility.
33. Power as a privilege.
34. Power as loneliness.
35. Psychological losses.
36. The abuse of power.
37. Power as political.

FOUR INITIAL SAMPLES

Our preliminary power orientation scale consisted of seventy-four items (two each for thirty-seven dimensions). At this point we were guided by Kadushin's injunction (1968, p. 690) that investigations of power "should be confined to those likely to have some in the first place." Kadushin's point was well taken,

even th ugh determining who has power requires subjective a priori determinations about what power is. Although such determinations were inconsistent with our decision not to define power on an a priori basis, it was felt that it would be reasonable to select subjects who were either in supervisory positions or higher, who were perceived as being in a position of power themselves, or who interacted with individuals whom others perceived as being in a position of power. Four samples meeting these criteria were selected.

The Corporate Sample

One sample of 166 subjects was drawn from the corporate sector of private business. Thirty different corporations were contacted to obtain the 166 respondents. Homogeneity within this sample was assumed because the organizations contacted were medium-sized corporations and were in service, as opposed to manufacturing, industries.

Qualifying respondents had to be a member of one of the following categories: (1) Individuals who carried a corporate title; (2) Individuals who were involved directly in the supervision or management of others within the corporation; and (3) Individuals considered as "staff" but who were responsible for participating in policy decisions which had an effect on the corporation as a whole.

The Law Enforcement Sample

This sample consisted of 134 uniformed state highway patrolmen on active duty at the time of the study. Homogeneity was assumed because all respondents were field officers from the same highway patrol system.

The Sales Sample

The third sample consisted of 126 sales associates from a medium-sized real estate firm. Homogeniety was assumed because all sales associates worked for the same firm and in the same geographic area. The considerable autonomy and influence possessed by the sales associate in mediating between a buyer and a seller on a

financial matter of considerable importance to both made this sample an appropriate one for inclusion in our investigation.

The Government Sample

The fourth sample consisted of 119 management and staff personnel from government agencies. The agencies were federal, and the respondents were predominantly individuals who held regional, rather than state or local responsibilities.

Responses to the preliminary (74-item version) Power Orientation Scale were obtained from the four samples. Following Harman's (1976) suggestions, separate factor-analyses were performed on the responses from each sample. Principal-component analyses followed by varimax rotations were performed on the responses of each of the four samples. At this point each sample was characterized by a set of factor structures. We regarded these factor structures as representing orientations toward power (or dimensions of the construct "power") existing within each of the four samples. We then turned our attention to identifying those orientations or dimensions, if any, which might recur across samples. At this stage in our investigation we were attempting to discover those orientations toward power which might be capable of describing a person's view of power, regardless of a specific population from which that given individual might be sampled.

COMPARING FACTOR STRUCTURES ACROSS SAMPLES

The factor analyses of the corporate, government, law-enforcement and sales samples generated 17, 17, 17 and 18 factors respectively. Variances accounted for were 68%, 69%, 79% and 72%, respectively. Harman (1976), Kaiser, Hunka and Bianchini (1971) and Horst (1961) have suggested strategies for comparing similarity of factor structures across samples. We selected the more conservative approach of correlating factor loadings across samples. Each set of factor loadings for each sample was correlated with every other set of factor loadings from every other sample. With four samples, there are six possible sets of pair-wise correlations.

In order for a factor to be considered comparable across samples, we set as a decision rule that all six-pair-wise correlations had to be significant at $p = .05$. Appendix I presents the results of these comparisons.

As may be seen from Appendix I, seven factors satisfied our decision rule for comparability. These seven factors were present to some degree in all four samples. We have concluded, for the time being at least, that seven orientations toward power are discernible and common to a reasonably wide variety of settings in which power is likely to be exercised. Having now reduced our Power Orientation Scale to a final set of 40 items, the following orientations toward power are represented within the scale.

Factor Cluster 1: Power as Good

Item 5: In the long run, it is better to avoid having power. (negative loading)
Item 16: The responsibility and challenge of power is exciting.
Item 18: Power is something to be avoided. (negative loading)
Item 32: I would like to be a powerful person.
Item 37: In general, powerful people do more harm than good. (negative loading)

This factor cluster represented the notion of power as a positive force. Individuals scoring high on this Power Orientation Factor might perceive power as exciting and desirable. With such an orientation, these individuals may be more agressive in their search for and maintenance of a power position.

Factor Cluster 2: Power as Resource Dependency

Item 6: Knowing things others don't know gives you power over them.
Item 7: You know you have power when other people must come to you for things they need.
Item 19: Having information that others want and need gives a person a great deal of power.
Item 20: People know they are powerful when others are dependent on them.

It is apparent from the analysis of this cluster that of all the resources an individual would control, that of knowledge or information appears to be central to this orientation. An individual scoring high on this Power Orientation Factor would appear to recognize the value of the possession and control of resources, especially information, and might be more attuned to the use of such resources.

Factor Cluster 3: Power as Instinctive Drive

Item 11: The drive for power exists in all of us.
Item 23: People naturally try to avoid feeling powerless.
Item 24: People instinctively seek power.

An individual who scores high on this Power Orientation Factor would appear to perceive the desire for power as a natural instinct rather than a desire nurtured within a particular environment. In other words, the desire for power is seen as a natural element of the human condition. The significant aspect of a high score on this factor is the perception of a drive for power as an attribute of all persons. As a result, to seek and to maintain power would be considered acceptable since all persons possess such a drive.

Factor Cluster 4: Power as Political

Item 28: It takes political skill to become powerful.
Item 40: Remaining in power requires political skill.

The factor loadings from items 28 and 40 were consistently high across all four of the samples. However, this might be the weakest of the factor clusters because only one dimension of power ("power as political") is represented. This dimension reflects the belief that an individual must approach the acquisition of power through the use of political tactics. An individual with a high score on this Power Orientation Factor might be one who is cognizant of the implications of "playing politics" to achieve and maintain power.

Factor Cluster 5: Power as Charisma

Item 24: Powerful people are easy to recognize, even in situations where they do nothing to demonstrate their power.
Item 31: You can usually tell a powerful person as soon as he or she enters the room.

Unlike Factor Cluster 4, this cluster is representative of two different dimensions of power. The first dimension (Item 24) is that of "power as potential". This dimension considered power as something that could be held in reserve and used

when needed by the source. The second dimension (Item 31) is that of "having impact". In this instance power is viewed as an ability to take strong action or to evoke emotional responses from others. It also included the idea that people behave differently toward individuals perceived as having power.

Factor Cluster 6: Power as Control

Item 1: An advantage of having power is being able to get people to follow your orders.
Item 3: Having power gives you independence.
Item 12: An advantage of being in a position of power is being able to control the rewards and punishments of others.
Item 30: An advantage to having power is the freedom it gives you.

Factor Cluster 6 contained items that were closely related to the items which constituted Factor Cluster 7. The correlations between Factor Cluster 6 and Factor Cluster 7 obtained from three of the samples used in the reliability and validity tests were .91, .94 and .95. Since these correlations were substantial, we felt the degree of similarity between the final two factor clusters was sufficient enough to justify collapsing the two for scoring and interpretation purposes. The factors and items from Factor Cluster 7 will be presented prior to further interpretation of this final factor cluster.

Factor Cluster 7: Power as Autonomy

Item 1: An advantage of having power is being able to get people to follow your orders.
Item 3: Having power gives you independence.
Item 30: An advantage to having power is the freedom it gives you.

Items 3 and 30 come from the "ability to resist control" dimension of power, and between Factor Cluster Six and Factor Cluster Seven these items loaded consistently and highly across all four of the samples. Item 1 from the "ability to control the person" dimension of power (Factor Cluster 6 and Factor Cluster 7) and Item 12 from the "ability to control sanctions" dimension (Factor Cluster 6) added strength to the combined clusters as the content of each were highly related.

It is not surprising that these two clusters were similar. Very often individuals in control are also those individuals perceived as highly autonomous. Conversely,

a high level of autonomy would appear to facilitate an individual's ability to maintain control. These final two clusters are interpreted jointly as "Power as Control and Autonomy." Individuals scoring high on this last Power Orientation Factor would appear to value power as a means of establishing control and maintaining their individual autonomy.

A total of six Power Orientation Factors were identified. They were: (1) Power as Good, (2) Power as Resource Dependency, (3) Power as Instinctive Drive, (4) Power as Political, (5) Power as Charisma, and (6) Power as Control and Autonomy. The 40-item Power Orientation Scale, included at the end of this paper, contains the items which constitute these factors, as well as additional items which loaded highly on a given factor in some, but not all, samples. The items were retained in the scale for masking and because of potential information in future investigations.

PRELIMINARY RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY CHECKS ON THE POWER ORIENTATION SCALE

Reliability

Since factor-analytic techniques were employed in the construction of the Power Orientation Scale (these techniques guarantee high intercorrelations among items comprising a given factor) we felt that internal consistency measures of reliability were already unfairly biased in favor of the instrument. Therefore, test-retest reliability was explored. Forty undergraduate college students were administered the scale initially and after a 3-week time lapse. Reliabilities for the 7 factor scores (prior to collapsing factors 6 and 7) are presented in Appendix II. As may be seen from examining Apprendix II, moderate to strong reliabilities were found for the 7 factor scores. The lower reliabilities are, as might be expected, associated with factors comprised of relatively few items. In general, we considered the reliabilities sufficient for pursuing issues associated with validity.

Validity

Although strong cases for content and construct validity can be made on the basis of the manner in which the Power Orientation Scale was constructed, we considered it more important at this point to pursue issues associated with concurrent validity. We selected as preliminary concurrent validity criteria the following: (1) decision-making behavior; (2) leadership behavior; and (3) dogmatism.

Validity Check One

The validity test reported here involves a comparison of sentencing decisions made by Denver District Court judges, with the judges' scores on the Power Orientation Scale.

Sentencing Guidelines. As of October, 1977, the Denver District Court (a Colorado State Court) has employed a statistically based sentencing guideline model to help in structuring judicial discretion. Historically, wide latitude has been granted to sentencing judges in the range of sanctions that they might impose on convicted offenders. It has been felt that while the wide range of available sanctions did contribute to an effort to "hand-tailor" the penalty to fit the crime, the by-product of the wide latitude could be "sentence disparity" from offender to offender, and from courtroom to courtroom. In an effort to insure equity in sentencing, the Denver District Court, with the assistance of the Law-Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), instituted a research program to develop and implement a sentencing guideline model to work within the parameters of the existing Colorado Penal Code. The aim of the guidelines project was to implement the sentiment that similarly situated offenders (prior criminal record and background) convicted of similar offenses should receive similar sentences.

The guideline model, as developed and implemented in the Denver District Court, is basically a descriptive model. That is, there is no presumption regarding what is the "right" sentence. The guideline sentence is based on

the sentencing history of the particular panel of judges serving on the criminal bench. In this sense, the guideline sentence is the average sentence handed down (in the preceding six months to one year interval) by all judges, for similarly situated offenders convicted of similar offenses.

The guideline that the judge receives at the sentencing hearing will either suggest an "out" decision (probation, deferred judgment, deferred prosecution, etc.) or an "in" decision with a range suggested for the duration of incarceration (i.e., two to four years). The judge's actual sentence will then either "hit" the guideline (i.e., he gives probation for an "out", or he incarcerates the offender to a term consistent with the guideline range) or he will "miss" the guideline (i.e., he incarcerates when the guideline suggests "out", or he probates when the guideline suggests incarceration). The sentencing decision then, with regard to the guideline may (1) hit the guideline, (2) miss the guideline in the direction of no incarceration, or (3) miss the guideline in the direction of incarceration. Percentage tables may then be drawn with respect to each individual judge's performance as measured against the guideline.

The sentencing decisions of nine district court judges for one year were transformed into percentages in each of three categories (hit, miss/incarceration, miss/no incarceration). These percentages, as well as the Power Orientation scores of the district court judges, were transformed to ranks and rank order correlations computed. A significant positive correlation was found between the "Power As Resource Dependency" factor and the sentencing criterion "hit" (Spearman rank order correlation = .61). District court judges who tended to view power more in terms of access to and possession of knowledge and information also tended to make more sentencing decisions which fell within established sentencing guidelines. Since these sentencing guidelines were, in fact, based upon feedback the judges had received concerning the sentencing behavior of other district court judges, this specific relationship is quite sensible.

No significant rank order correlations were found between power orientation scores and the sentencing criterion "miss/no incarceration." A significant negative correlation was found between "Power As Instinctive Drive" and the sentencing criterion "miss/incarceration" (Spearman rank order correlation = -.63). The higher a judge's score on this "Power As Instinctive Drive" factor, the less likely was he to impose incarceration when the guidelines didn't call for it. Apparently, the perception of power as a positive and natural element of the human condition is accompanied by a greater willingness to exercise power in favor of the offender.

These two relationships provided preliminary support for the assumption that an individual's power orientation may be related to decision-making behavior.

Validity Check Two

To examine leadership, Fiedler's (1967) Least Preferred Coworker was selected. The scale provides an index of the likelihood that a leader will adopt an "interpersonal" or a "task-oriented" approach in relating with subordinates. Forty-eight "business leaders," identified by representatives of the Denver Chamber of Commerce, responded to both the Power Orientation Scale and the LPC. A weak, but significant (-.278) correlation was found between "Power As Resource Dependency" and the LPC score. This inverse relationship implies that managers who score high on "Power As Resource Dependency" are more likely to maintain psychological distance from their subordinates and adopt a task-oriented approach. Apparently, the tendency to view power as emanating from access to and possession of information not readily available to others is associated with beliefs such as "I know more than they do about the job," or "I'm the one who knows what has to be done." Such beliefs would be consistent with psychological distancing and greater emphasis on task dimensions of the supervisory-subordinate relationship.

Validity Check Three

To explore relationships among power orientations and dogmatism, Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale, Form E was selected. Thirty-three Denver area leaders, again selected by representatives of the Denver Chamber of Commerce, responded both to the Power Orientation Scale and the Dogmatism Scale. Two significant correlations were found. The "Power As Good" factor correlated negatively with dogmatism (-.40). Respondents who saw power in positive terms as exciting, or as something to be sought, scored lower on the dogmatism scale. The second significant correlation was between "Power as Control and Autonomy" and dogmatism (+.38). Respondents who saw power in terms of the ability it gives one to control others scored higher on the dogmatism scale. These two relationships, interpreted together, provide a rather intriguing view of personal orientations toward power. Viewing power as a mechanism for exercising control over others is associated with dogmatism; however, viewing power as good, challenging, and exciting is associated with less dogmatism. It seems reasonable, though some may be surprised by it, that viewing power in positive terms is not necessarily associated with intolerance toward other points of view. Perhaps more important, viewing power as a means for exercising control over others was associated with general intolerance towards beliefs inconsistent with those of the respondents.

We are guardedly optimistic about the results of these preliminary reliability and validity checks. There do seem to be some relationships between an individual's personal orientation toward power and his or her decision-making behavior, leaderships predisposition, and dogmatism. Our fourth validity check, now in progress, is an exploration of the relationships between the power orientation factors and the probability that a given individual will engage in confirming or disconfirming communicative behavior toward others. We believe that orientations toward power will ultimately predict these and a great many other classes

of communicative behavior. To this end we submit our preliminary findings, and hope that others may be sufficiently interested in and concerned about the power construct to add additional empirical findings to these.

REFERENCES

Adler, A. The psychology of power. Journal of Individual Psychology, 1966, 22, 166-172.

Berle, A. Power. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1969.

Breed, W. The self-guiding society. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Brown, C. T. & Keller, P. W. Monologue to dialogue: an exploration of interpersonal communication. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Burt, R. S. Power in a social topology. Social Science Research, 1977, 6, 1-83.

Cartwright, D. A field theoretical conception of power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan: University of Michigan, 1959.

_____. Influence, leadership, control. In J. G. March (Ed.), Handbook of organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1965.

Champlin, J. On the study of power. Politics and Society, 1971, 1, 91-111.

Clark, T. N. The concept of power. In T. Clark (Ed.), Community structure and decision making: comparative analysis. San Francisco: Chandler Publishign Company, 1968.

DeCharms, R. Personal causation. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Emerson, R. A. Power-dependence relations. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 31-41.

Fiedler, F. E. A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

French, Jr., J. R. B. & Raven, B. The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1959.

Gamson, W. Power and probability. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), Perspectives on social power. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1974.

Gross, G. M. Organizations and their managing. New York: Free Press 1968.

Guardini, R. Power and responsibility: a course of action for the new age. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1961.

Harman, H. H. Modern factor analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Harsanyi, J. E. Measurement of social power, opportunity costs, and the theory of two-person bargaining games. Behavior Science, 1962, 7, 67-80.

Hillenbrand, J. J. Power and morals. Chicago: Columbia University Press, 1949.

Hobbes, T. Of power. In J. R. Champlin (Ed.), Power, New York: Atherton Press, 1971.

Homans, G. C. Social behavior as exchange. American Journal of Sociology, 1958, 63, 597-606.

Horst, P. Generalized canonical correlations and their applications to experimental data. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1961, 17, 331-347.

Kadushin, C. Power, influence and social circles: a new methodology for studying opinion makers. American Sociological Review, 1968, 33, 685-699.

Kahn, R. & Boulding, E. Power and conflict in organizations. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.

Kaiser, H. H., Hunka, S. and Bianchini, J. C. Relating factors between studies based upon different individuals. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1971, 6, 409-422.

Kelman, H. C. Further thoughts on the processes of compliance, identification, and internalization. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), Perspectives on social power. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, Inc., 1974.

Kipnis, D. The powerholders. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), Perspectives on social power. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, Inc., 1974.

Lehman, E. W. Toward a macrosociology of power. American Sociological Review, 1969, 34, 453-465.

Levinger, G. The development of perceptions and behavior in newly formed social power relationships. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, 1959.

March, J. G. An introduction to the theory and measurement of influence. American Political Science Review, 1955, 49, 431-451.

Martin, N. H. & Sims, J. H. Thinking ahead: power tactics. Harvard Business Review, 1956, 34, 25-36, 140.

Martin, R. The concept of power: a critical defense. British Journal of Sociology, 1971, 22, 240-256.

May, R. Power and innocence. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1972.

McClelland, D. C. Power : the inner experience. New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc., 1975.

Miller, G. R. The pervasiveness and marvelous complexity of human communication: a note of skepticism. Keynote address presented at the 4th Annual Conference in Communication, California State Univeristy, Fresno, May 1977.

Minton, H. L. Power and personality. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), The social influence processes. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, Inc., 1972.

Nagel, J. H. The descriptive analysis of power. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1975.

Raven, B. H. Social influence and power. In I. D. Steiner & M. Fishbein, (Eds.), Current studies in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1965.

Riker, W. H. Some ambiguities in the notion of power. American Political Science Review, 1964, 58, 341-349.

Rosinski, H. Power and human destiny. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965.

Schopler, J. & Layton, B. D. Attributions of interpersonal power. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), Perspectives on social power. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1974.

Selltiz C., Wrightsman, L. S. & Cook, S. W. Research methods in social relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976.

Sites, P. Control: the basis of social order. New York: Dunellen Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.

Tedeschi, J. T. & Bonoma, T. V. Power and influence: an introduction. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), The social influence processes. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, Inc., 1972.

Thibaut, J. W. & Kelley, H. The social psychology of groups. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959.

Votaw, D. What do we believe about power?. California Management Review, 1966, 8, 71-88.

Winter, D. G. The power motive. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Appendix I

Significant Factor Clusters Emerging From Comparisons of Factors Across Samples

C = Corporate Sample
G = Government Sample
S = Sales Sample
L = Law-Enforcement Sample

FACTOR CLUSTER 1

Factors	C	G	S	L
C	1.00	.84	.76	.66
G	.84	1.00	.65	.65
S	.76	.65	1.00	.60
L	.66	.65	.60	1.00

FACTOR CLUSTER 2

Factors	C	G	S	L
C	1.00	.81	.80	.47
G	.81	1.00	.73	.54
S	.80	.73	1.00	.49
L	.47	.54	.49	1.00

FACTOR CLUSTER 3

Factors	C	G	S	L
C	1.00	.58	.82	.50
G	.58	1.00	.58	.36
S	.82	.58	1.00	.44
L	.50	.36	.44	1.00

Appendix II

Test-Retest Correlations of Power Orientation Factor Scores Over Three Weeks

N = 40

FACTOR		r
1	(Power as Good)	.83
2	(Power as Resource Dependency)	.77
3	(Power as Instinctive Drive)	.49
4	(Power as Political)	.62
5	(Power as Charisma)	.54
6	(Power as Control)	.63
7	(Power as Autonomy)	.55

FACTOR CLUSTER 4

Factors	C	G	S	L
C	1.00	.73	.75	.35
G	.73	1.00	.60	.33
S	.75	.60	1.00	.46
L	.35	.33	.46	1.00

FACTOR CLUSTER 5

Factors	C	G	S	L
C	1.00	.61	.76	.63
G	.61	1.00	.64	.54
S	.76	.64	1.00	.52
L	.63	.54	.52	1.00

FACTOR CLUSTER 6

Factors	C	G	S	L
C	1.00	.58	.68	.51
G	.58	1.00	.42	.27
S	.68	.42	1.00	.38
L	.51	.27	.38	1.00

FACTOR CLUSTER 7

Factors	C	G	S	L
C	1.00	.46	.58	.56
G	.46	1.00	.53	.51
S	.58	.53	.46	1.00
L	.56	.51	.46	1.00

POWER ORIENTATION SCALE

Instructions

Power means different things to different people. We are interested in how you personally view power. What does power mean to you? We are not interested in what you think power means to others. Instead, we want to know how you view power and how you feel about power.

Your responses will be kept entirely confidential. Your name will not be attached to your responses. The only individuals who will see your responses will be members of the research team. No one in the organization for which you work will be allowed to see your answers. Please be honest and candid in your responses. This research project will benefit greatly from your direct and honest responses to these statements.

The following are all statements about power. You may find that you agree strongly with some of these and disagree strongly with others. You may also find there are some statements you are uncertain about. Whether you agree or disagree with any of the statements, you can be sure that many other people feel the same as you do.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one.

Write +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

+1:	I AGREE A LITTLE	-1:	I DISAGREE A LITTLE
+2:	I AGREE ON THE WHOLE	-2:	I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE
+3	I AGREE VERY MUCH	-3:	I DISAGREE VERY MUCH

( ) 1. An advantage of having power is being able to get people to follow your orders.

( ) 2. People in powerful positions are often rewarded for doing very little.

( ) 3. Having power gives you independence.

( ) 4. An advantage of being in a position of power is that people seem to treat you as somebody special.

( ) 5. In the long run, it is better to avoid having power.

( ) 6. Knowing things others don't know gives you power over them.

( ) 7. You know you have power when other people must come to you for things they need.

( ) 8. An advantage to being considered powerful is that other people want to be like you.

( ) 9. A person can be powerful within one group and not within another.

( ) 10. There is no such thing as power without purpose.

( ) 11. The drive for power exists in all of us.

( ) 12. An advantage of being in a position of power is being able to control the rewards and punishments of others.

( ) 13. Powerful people are cautious about whom they confide in.

( ) 14. Success and power go hand in hand.

( ) 15. If you have power, you have a sense of security.

( ) 16. The responsibility and challenge of power is exciting.

( ) 17. People seek power for its own sake.

( ) 18. Power is something to be avoided.

( ) 19. Having information that others want and need gives a person a great deal of power.

( ) 20. People know they are powerful when others are dependent on them.

( ) 21. People usually deserve the power they get.

( ) 22. How much power a person has varies considerably from one situation to another.

( ) 23. People naturally try to avoid feeling powerless.

( ) 24. Powerful people are easy to recognize, even in situations where they do nothing to demonstrate their power.

( ) 25. Sometimes powerful people cannot avoid hurting others.

( ) 26. The meek shall inherit the earth.

( ) 27. Power means the ability to beat the competition.

( ) 28. It takes political skill to become powerful.

( ) 29. Sometimes it's necessary for a powerful person to tell people what they should think.

( ) 30. An advantage to having power is the freedom it gives you.

( ) 31. You can usually tell a powerful person as soon as he or she enters a room.

( ) 32. I would like to be a powerful person.

( ) 33. Power comes from being an expert in something.

( ) 34. People instinctively seek power.

( ) 35. Whether power is good or bad depends on the type of person who has it.

( ) 36. Power should be used to do the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

( ) 37. In general, powerful people do more harm than good.

( ) 38. Having power means that people may not like you.

( ) 39. Powerful people are likely to feel anxious.

( ) 40. Remaining in power requires political skill.